

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 332 352

EA 023 009

AUTHOR Hanson, Marjorie
TITLE Alteration of Influence Relations in School-Based Management Innovations.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Decentralization; Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Institutional Autonomy; *Interprofessional Relationship; Peer Evaluation; *Personal Autonomy; Policy Formation; Power Structure; *Professional Autonomy; Program Evaluation; *School Based Management; School Restructuring; *Teacher Administrator Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Dade County Public Schools FL

ABSTRACT

The extent to which school-based management actually altered influence relations between a district office and schools and between principals and teachers is examined in this report. Five innovative initiatives implemented in the Dade County Public Schools--peer evaluation, different teacher roles, block scheduling, school-within-a-school, and teachers as advisors--were evaluated. Methodology involved administrative reviews of individual school-based management pilot schools for 1988, 1989, and 1990, and analysis of proposals to formulate an estimate of impact using the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire database. Findings indicate that while school-level discretion was allowed in some areas of decision-making, most deviations from regular policy were subject to approval by central office administrators. Within schools, teacher involvement altered teacher-principal relations, which were mitigated by principal supervision of the innovation and limited teacher involvement. Overall, the pilot school-based management project recorded no change in district/school relations and some change in teacher/principal relations. Factors for successful implementation include a supportive superintendent, a systematic training program, a pool of sponsored innovations, and increased knowledge of organizational behavior. The findings call into question the assumptions of increased efficiency through reorganization and increased innovation through autonomy. The appendix presents procedures for teacher peer evaluation. (16 references) (LMI)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

**ALTERATION OF INFLUENCE RELATIONS
IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT INNOVATIONS**

by Marjorie Hanson
Dade County Public Schools

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Hanson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association

Chicago, April 7, 1991

ALTERATION OF INFLUENCE RELATIONS IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT INNOVATIONS

Overviews of literature on school-based management (David, 1989b; Malen, Ogawa and Kranz, In press) have yielded conclusions and questions relevant to district administrators. Observing that there are few systematic investigations of implementations of the concept, Malen et al. (In press) question whether school-based management actually alters influence relations among district office and schools, and principals and teachers.

In this paper, I shall examine the extent to which influence relations between the district office and schools and principals and teachers were altered in Dade County's three-year pilot of school-based management. My examination makes use of information gathered in the evaluation of innovations proposed and implemented by the pilot schools (Collins and Hanson, 1991). Individuals interested in the full results of the evaluation of innovations may request a copy of that evaluation from Dade County Public Schools' Office of Educational Accountability.

First, I shall provide some background information: a definition of school-based management that reflects the spirit of the Dade County model; a history of school-based management in Dade County, including the evaluation plan; and a more detailed description of the evaluation of innovations that took place under the school-based management pilot program. After this introductory material, I shall examine the extent to which school-based management actually altered influence relations, first, between the district office and the schools and, second, between principals and teachers. I shall close the paper with discussion of conclusions and implications of this study.

What is School-Based Management?

Although the public media, professional literature, and school practice have focussed extensive attention on school-based management in recent years, there is neither clarity nor agreement on its definition or worth (Malen et al., In press). It has been hailed as a promising venture (AASA/NAESP/NASSP School-Based Management Task Force, 1988; Stover, 1989; Wissler and Ortiz, 1988) and characterized as an idle, even harmful, exercise (McGill, 1989; Moloney, 1989).

Shanker's conditions requisite for full-scale participation in a voluntary competition among schools in the United States reflect both the rationale and the characteristics of the Dade County school-based management plan.

...[P]articipating schools must be free to develop new ideas and to try new practices. So management would be required to waive all regulations that might keep schools from considering any and all promising changes--except of course for rules dealing with health, safety, and civil rights. Similarly, unions would have to grant their members the right to waive provisions of union contracts that stand in the way of promising changes. School boards would also have to give each participating school control of its share of the budget--not just control of trivial, discretionary funds but control of all the funds.

Each school would perform all functions for itself, from curriculum development to maintaining the heating plant. Schools might purchase some of these services from the central office, or they might contract for services from private vendors. And to the extent that schools did not need the services of the central office, that bureaucracy would have to shrink, thus making more money available to the schools them-

selves. Finally, since the participating schools in a district would vary a good deal in what they were doing, school boards would have to permit parental choice.

A time span of three or more years is essential for the competition. With less, people wouldn't have enough time to experiment with new ways of doing things. If you take a wrong turn during the first year of a two-year project, that's it--you're not going to recover. So most people would play it safe and make some simple change instead of taking a risk with something that might really make a difference.

Moreover, it takes time for new practices to show results . . .

(Shanker, 1990, 334-5)

History of School-Based Management in Dade County

Dade County Public Schools (DCPS) initiated school-based management in 1987 with a plan that, except for parental choice, paralleled the conditions laid out by Shanker (Collins, 1988). Growing out of a joint Dade County Public Schools/United Teachers of Dade task force on the professionalization of teaching, the plan included both school-based management, or the delegation of decisions regarding budget, curriculum, and personnel to school sites, and shared decision-making, or participation of staff, students, and community members in decisions regarding the school. The program was called, School-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making (SBM/SDM).

In January 1987 requests for proposals (RFPs) were sent to building principals and union stewards inviting schools to become pilot SBM/SDM schools and participate in a three-year "test" of the idea. Committees at schools developed proposals that included three elements: 1) a description of the means by which school personnel decided that they would like to participate; 2) a description of the proposed procedures for shared decision-making; and 3) justification for and description of as many innovations as the staff desired to pursue. Thirty-three of almost three hundred Dade County schools were accepted into the program, based on the proposals they had submitted.

These pilot schools--18 elementary schools, 10 middle schools, 4 senior high schools, and 1 technical education center--implemented their proposals during the 1987-88 school year and participated in a program evaluation that began that year and continued through 1989-90. Other Dade County schools entered into SBM/SDM toward the end of the second year of the pilot (1988-89). Despite this and other inevitable "contaminations" of the control schools, the length of the pilot program offered a rare opportunity to examine school-based management implementation and impact over a 3-year period for a subset of schools in a large urban district.

The evaluation plan followed the design of the program, with formative assessment at the close of each of the first two years and summative assessment at the end of the third year. Reports were prepared at three levels: 1) school staff carried out administrative reviews each year, with technical help from Office of Educational Accountability (OEA) staff; 2) OEA staff carried out a project-wide evaluation of all thirty-three schools each year; and 3) OEA staff carried out an evaluation of clusters of schools involved in selected innovations at the close of the three year period. The papers in this symposium use data gathered for the DCPS evaluation of school-based management, supplemented by additional surveys and district data bases.

Evaluation of the Innovations

SBM/SDM pilot schools proposed and implemented a variety of innovations ranging from programs for at-risk students to a "wellness room" for staff sponsored jointly with a local

university. I evaluated five of these innovations--peer evaluation, different roles for teachers, block scheduling, school-within-a-school, and teachers as advisors. I examined both the extent of implementation and the impact of the innovations.

Design of the Evaluation

The Population

Schools included in this evaluation initiated innovations during the first year of the pilot (1987-88) and, thus, had potentially three full years for implementation. I have recorded the number of schools included in the evaluation of each innovation in Table 1. Although many staffs modified the original innovations in subsequent years, over 90% of innovations initiated during 1987-88 remained at the end of 1989-90.

Table 1

Extent of Implementation of Five Innovations

Innovation	Proposed	Implemented* (1987-88)	Continued (1988-89)	Continued (1989-90)
Peer Evaluation	9	9	7	8**
Different Teacher Roles	14	11	11	10
Block Scheduling	9	9	9	9
School-Within-a-School	5	5	4	4
Teachers as Advisors	8	6	6	6

*Other SBM/SDM schools that adopted the innovation before SBM, implemented the innovation under another program, or implemented the innovation after the first year of SBM (1987-88) were not included in this evaluation.

**One school that dropped Peer Evaluation in 1988-89 reinstituted it in 1989-90. Only the seven schools that participated all three years are included in the evaluation.

Data Sources

In order to address the two major themes of this evaluation, implementation of the innovations and their impact, I used two types of data sources. First, I examined administrative reviews by individual SBM/SDM pilot schools for 1988, 1989, and 1990 for information on implementation. While administrative reviews varied among schools, they generally contained descriptions of the SBM/SDM program, initial outcomes, and recommendations. I supplemented information from reviews with discussions with OEA coordinators who helped the schools with their reviews and interviews with school-level personnel.

Second, I obtained estimates of impact from the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire administered by OEA and from DCPS data bases. To identify the intended impact of the innovations, I scanned proposals submitted by pilot SBM/SDM schools. Factors relevant to one or more of the innovations included rapport among teachers, satisfaction with teaching, staff professionalism, staff curriculum issues, student achievement, student attendance, and student discipline. I collected and analyzed data from a baseline year prior to the implementation of SBM/SDM (1986-87) and from the three years of the pilot (1987-88 through 1989-90).

Even after three years of implementation, estimates of the impact of these innovations must be tentative. Since other Dade County schools were implementing similar innovations, the unique impact of innovations at Pilot 1 schools can only be roughly estimated. Distinguishing SBM/SDM schools from others was particularly difficult for middle schools where variations of School-Within-a-School and Teachers as Advisors programs were being implemented according to a district-wide schedule.

The Innovations and Their Impact

The following are brief statements about implementation and initial impact of these five innovations under SBM/SDM.

Peer Evaluation

Nine pilot schools implemented Peer Evaluation during 1987-88, seven continued through 1988-89, and one returned to make a total of eight in 1989-90. In most of these schools, TADS-trained teachers conducted formal classroom observations, whereas in two schools, TADS-trained teachers took on less formal roles. In most Peer Evaluation schools, rapport among teachers and student achievement improved relative to other DCPS schools.

Different Roles for Teachers

Eleven schools implemented Different Roles for Teachers during 1987-88 and ten continued through 1989-90. This innovation involved teachers participating in administrative duties, such as discipline, hiring, and team leadership, on a full- or part-time basis. Schools implementing Different Roles for Teachers were higher than DCPS schools in the proportion of teachers with advanced degrees or Professional Incentive Program points for one or two years of the project, but the advantage disappeared by 1989-90. In middle schools where teachers took on discipline roles, outdoor suspensions dropped more than the DCPS rate from 1986-87 to 1989-90.

Block Scheduling

Nine elementary schools implemented Block Scheduling during 1987-88 and all continued through 1989-90. At most schools this innovation took on creative forms designed to set aside larger blocks of uninterrupted time for basic skills instruction. Staff at schools participating in Block Scheduling exhibited more satisfaction with curriculum issues than staff at SBM/SDM schools as a whole at the end of 1989-90. Students at these schools also had slightly higher achievement as measured by State competency exams in 1988-89, but no advantage on the Stanford Achievement Test in 1990.

School-Within-a-School

Three middle schools and two senior highs proposed and implemented some form of School-Within-a-School during 1987-88. One middle school implemented a radically

partitioned structure during the first year, whereas the other two set apart only their sixth grades with future intentions for school-wide implementation. Each of the three middle schools continued the innovations, making revisions as needed. The senior high schools implemented discrete "schools" for at-risk students within their schools. Both senior highs reverted to less segregated programs for their at-risk students in 1988-89. Senior high schools with School-Within-a-School programs did slightly better than SBM/SDM schools as a whole in student achievement as measured by the State competency exams. Middle schools with this innovation did not show any advantage over SBM/SDM schools as a whole or other district schools.

Teachers as Advisors

Six secondary schools implemented Teachers as Advisors programs in 1987-88 and all continued the programs through 1989-90. Four programs were school-wide, involving daily teacher contact with all advisees; the others were smaller programs. Middle schools implementing Teachers as Advisors programs decreased the proportion of students with outdoor suspensions to a rate comparable to the DCPS rate for middle schools. Prior to the outset of SBM/SDM, these schools had a higher outdoor suspension rate than either SBM/SDM schools as a whole or DCPS.

Innovations as Indicators of Altered Influence Relations

School-based management, whereby school staff are freed to chart their own courses, is one of way of restructuring the educational system. It is based on the assumption that units closest to clients understand their needs better than remote central office or state policymakers. Often this restructuring involves greater teacher roles in school-level decisions in addition to greater school site freedom from central office dictates. Whether influence relations among these parties are actually altered under the restructuring called school-based management has been cause for question (Malen et al., In press).

A number of avenues could be used to explore this question. One obvious means would be to examine changes in formal and informal communication patterns between school-based management schools and central office personnel and between principals and teachers. I will use another approach, examining information on innovations that were implemented as a means of identifying the extent to which influence relations altered.

Innovations are a particularly rich framework from which to examine this question since they represent actual outcomes of deliberations at schools. The degree to which these innovations are departures from district-advocated practice or from common practice is an indicator of shift in influence relations between SBM/SDM schools and the district. And the degree and nature of participation by staff in design and implementation of the innovations is an indicator of shift in influence relations between teachers and principals.

First, I shall examine influence relations between the district and individual schools. Then, I shall examine influence relations between principals and teachers. At each level, I shall discuss formal arrangements for shifting influence relations and actual shifts of influence relations in practice.

Between District and School

Authority Formally Delegated to School-Level Governing Bodies

Authority in the areas of personnel, budget, and educational program was transferred to schools according to the RFP distributed to principals and union stewards in 1987. A few

budget categories (utilities, substitute money, unrestricted categorical units, and equivalent dollars for special services previously at the area and district level, such as inservice) were automatically turned over to each school-based management school. However, unlike Shanker's proposal to entrust almost *all* policy decisions to school-level personnel, school personnel were not given the authority to overrule local or state policy or teacher contract specifications.

Petitions for waiver of policy restrictions were handled on a case by case basis. These petitions were screened at first by the Professionalization Issues Review Committee on school-based management, chaired by the deputy superintendent and the union president. Later the district's school-based management office, to which the pilot schools reported in lieu of area offices, screened these petitions. A school opting to implement Peer Evaluation, for example, must request a waiver to allow such a component and the waiver must be granted. They would then be required to follow procedures for Peer Evaluation laid out by the district's Bureau of Human Resource Development and the union's Director of Professional Standards. Thus, although the purpose was to free schools considerably to lay out policy according to their own staff and community discretion, policy exceptions were granted only by state, district, and union personnel.

On the other hand, many school districts institute school-based management along with one or two mandated innovations, such as Peer Evaluation or Block Scheduling, rather than allowing schools to choose. Although this practice dilutes the intent of school-based management, it allows central office personnel to focus their support. Dade County made no such formal mandates in connection with school-based management. Each school was free to pursue innovations selected by its staff.

Actual Alteration of Influence Relations Between District and School

Observations regarding implementation of innovations provide some indication of actual alteration of influence patterns between the district and individual schools under SBM/SDM. The five innovations were, for the most part, implemented, but schools often implement change without the increased flexibility afforded by school-based management. For example, many schools adopted creative solutions to overcrowding, and junior high schools were converting to middle school status under the direction of the district. In order to observe the extent to which the five innovations provide evidence of altered influence patterns, I will examine magnitude of change and autonomy.

Magnitude of change. Magnitude of change brought about by innovation is one indicator of the alteration of influence patterns between DCPS central administration and individual SBM/SDM schools. Cuban (1988) describes the notion of first-order vs. second-order change. First-order changes involve improving the efficiency of the current system, that is, of the current structure of programs. In contrast, second-order changes occur when school staff "reframe original problems and restructure organizational conditions to conform with the redefined problems. . . . [Changes of this type] suggest basic changes in one or more areas of school operations" (p. 229). Second-order changes independent of DCPS mandates then might provide evidence of altered influence patterns between schools and central office.

Most changes taking place under these innovations were first order. Most Block Scheduling programs, for example, were first-order adjustments of available time that allowed teachers to accomplish more of what they were already doing. Similarly, first-order changes dominated Different Roles for Teachers and Peer Evaluation, under which teachers took on administrative roles. Although the added support may have caused schools to run more smoothly, no fundamental change occurred in the administrative system.

School-Within-a-School and Teachers as Advisors innovations in middle schools were second-order changes, but they were mandated by DCPS and supported by state grant monies. Even so, two middle schools took first-order approaches to Teachers as Advisors programs. Since not all teachers participated, their programs amounted to slight increases in traditional affective experiences in schools, such as extra support for at-risk students from some teachers and discussions of affective topics in social studies classes. In these schools, SBM/SDM initiative allowed resistance to second-order change being encouraged by DCPS.

A few second-order changes occurred among the innovations. At three Block Scheduling schools, second-order curricular and schedule changes occurred. Teachers at one elementary school, for example, felt they could present content areas better by each concentrating on one subject, rather than covering them all. They also felt that students would have more hands-on experiences, etc., if content were taught in larger blocks of time. Their solution was to each specialize in one subject and to allow students to experience each content area exclusively for six weeks. Students would then rotate to the next content area and eventually experience them all. The basic structure of both the curriculum and the schedule was changed under this Block Scheduling innovation. Similar changes took place in the other two schools in Spanish language instruction and language arts.

One middle school took the School-Within-a-School concept beyond the typical interpretation, establishing grade level houses, complete with their own administrator, counselor, and clerical staff. Assistant principal/guidance counselor pairs were assigned to follow one cohort of students throughout its years at the school. The assistant principal, therefore, handled any administrative questions that arose and attended team meetings for that cohort. The principal was the administrator assigned to the enrichment and ESE departments. Each cohort occupied a unique section of the school depending on its grade level, despite the scheduling challenges of an overcrowded school.

Although the basic structure of the plan remained in place at the end of the third year (1989-90), some functions were returned to the central office. Clerical, FTE-related functions, such as attendance and registrar operations, and free and reduced price lunch applications were recentralized. In order to be accessible to the entire school, the principal resumed weekly meetings with all department chairs. Assistant principals that had been carrying out all administrative functions for their cohort became specialized again, with one carrying out school-wide curricular tasks, including textbook ordering, and two performing disciplinary duties. Many of these changes occurred after some of the original planners, including the principal, transferred to a newly opening school.

The Teachers as Advisors program at one senior high school was a second-order departure from the status quo. Although advisement was encouraged by both the state, through the availability of grant monies, and the district, through efforts to return to a home room period, most senior high schools that got involved simply provided a few assemblies on advisement topics throughout the year. The SBM/SDM high school that took on student advisement, however, entered the program wholeheartedly with daily 35 minute periods of instruction devoted to advisement and public service topics, as well as individual conferences. Video presentations were developed and aired in order to provide content to stimulate discussion. Despite initial start-up problems due to shortage of materials and training and some continuing faculty perceptions that it is not operating as intended, the program is being continued, albeit in a reduced (16-minute) format.

In conclusion, first-order change was the norm under the increased flexibility allowed by SBM/SDM. Only about five out of almost forty innovations were unmandated second-

order change, although about four second-order innovations also occurred that were mandated district-wide for middle schools. It seems likely that SBM/SDM added impetus to district-mandated second-order changes like School-Within-a-School in middle schools since forums like shared decision making bodies and other faculty committees could be used to rally support among faculty. Therefore, it could be argued that school-based management reinforced rather than modified the traditional top-down relationship between central administration and schools.

Autonomy. Autonomy, or uniqueness of innovations, is a second indicator of the actual alteration of influence patterns between DCPS central administration and individual SBM/SDM schools. In districts that employ school-based management, schools tend to differ from each other more than in traditionally managed districts. However, there are many forces that work against these differences. Despite the lip-service paid to individual school initiative, education policies at all levels of government mandate uniformity in standards and programs. In addition, it may be natural for districts with a long history of school-based management to recentralize periodically in order to ensure basic conformity in district programs (Wissler and Ortiz, 1988). Implementation of innovations different from those at other SBM/SDM schools might provide evidence of altered influence patterns between schools and central office standardizing tendencies.

Since all exceptions from policy required official waivers, diversity was constrained by the formal approval system. Thus, some uniqueness was prevented when waivers were not approved. Other diversity was prevented under procedures stipulated when certain waivers were granted.

Peer Evaluation, for example, required a waiver, and Peer Evaluation procedures were distributed to schools that had been granted a waiver (See Appendix). Not surprisingly, most implementations of Peer Evaluation were quite similar. Lead teachers, department heads, or other respected teachers were selected and trained to carry out observations. Their primary responsibility in teacher evaluation was conducting formal observations, a task usually performed by administrators. Almost sixty percent of teachers in these schools had been involved in the program at the end of three years of implementation.

Similarly, state and local requirements for time spent on various subjects constrained Block Scheduling innovations, and most elementary schools implemented them simply to obtain some control over fragmentation and pull-outs. Different Roles for Teachers were constrained by staffing and class size policies. Waivers were granted that allowed exceptions to these policies, but individual schools were dependent on district approval in order to have their exceptions granted and the new roles tended to mirror roles typically filled by administrators in traditionally organized schools. Similarly, state and local middle school models tended to define Different Roles for Teachers (team leaders), School-Within-a-School, and Teachers as Advisors innovations district-wide for those schools, leaving little room for diversity.

Despite these policy constraints, there were a few unique interpretations of innovations in which administrative functions were carried out under structures very different from the typical ones. The best example of this phenomenon was an elementary school Peer Evaluation program that differed in several ways from the administrative pattern followed in other schools. Although this school began the program a year later than the other schools in the evaluation, seventy per cent of the staff had participated by the end of two years of implementation.

First, this program was wholly voluntary. Only teachers who volunteered to be observed by peers could serve as an observer of peers. As in other schools only a few teachers were

trained in the observation method, but these were elected by the staff. Each teacher selected a team of teachers from fellow volunteers to observe him or her, specified a time, and requested the specific aspect of teaching to be noticed. Only the leader of the team needed to have training in the observation process. After the post-observation conference, the observed teacher could opt to let the observation count as the official requirement or choose to be observed again. There were three advantages to this procedure: 1) teachers were observed only by colleagues who were also willing to be observed; 2) non-trained teachers learned much from serving as observers along with teachers that had been trained; 3) the procedure was both voluntary and official, fulfilling a requirement that would have to be carried out one way or another.

Two other elementary schools instituted models of Peer Evaluation designed to provide less threatening interaction among peers. In these models, which were voluntary, trained observers advised teachers, but did not conduct official observations. These models, which were also quite unique were only marginally implemented probably because they lacked any official status. Only twenty-five percent of teachers had participated by the end of three years of implementation.

Among Different Roles for Teachers, some lead teacher roles in middle schools differed from other models in that they supported teaching rather than the administration of schools. In one case, teachers were actively recruited and selected by staff from a district-wide pool of applicants. Following a job description developed by members of the faculty, these teachers spent a portion of their time coaching beginning teachers and, to a less realized extent, supporting professional development of all teachers.

In conclusion, with few exceptions, schools did not exhibit much autonomy from county and state standards and controls in the innovations they designed and implemented. Consequently, innovations in SBM/SDM schools differed little from each other.

Between Principals and Teachers

Formal Provision for Alteration of Relations

There were formal provisions for an alteration of relationships between principals and teachers in the requirements for preparing proposals to become SBM/SDM schools. The RFP called for involvement of the union steward in preparation of the proposal, reporting of "actions taken to insure consensus of decision to request participation," and development of a shared decision-making model.

Union steward involvement. RFPs were sent to both the principal and the union steward at each school in the county. This enabled persons filling either position to initiate participation in SBM/SDM. Furthermore, the completed proposal was to be signed by both the principal and the union steward.

Actions taken to insure consensus. One section of the proposal was a description of actions taken to inform the staff and to insure consensus for requesting participation in SBM/SDM.

Shared decision making model. The shared decision making model was a required part of the proposal. Although the intent to involve teachers (as well as students, community members, and parents) was clear from the stated philosophy and goals of the SBM/SDM program, no particular structure for such involvement was mandated. Thus, school staff were free to develop structures of their own and provide for alteration of relationships as they desired.

Actual Alteration of Influence Relations Between Principals and Teachers

Since distribution of decision-making power was left to individual schools, the involvement of teachers in the five innovations and nature of roles played by teachers in them illustrate how influence relations among administrators and teachers were altered.

Involvement of teachers. Teachers participated in innovations in different ways, and were affected by them in varying degrees. Cuban (1988) asserts that success of school improvement depends upon "professional accountability," whereby teachers, principals, and central office administrators hold each other accountable for implementation. On the other hand, unassigned responsibilities tend to fall to the individual who is available when decisions need to be made. Since principals serve 12-month contracts and are more available even during the school year than teachers, there is a tendency for day-to-day decisions to fall to them. The extent to which "professional accountability," or accountability shared among teachers and principals, prevailed over the traditional arrangement of principal accountability is an indicator of the extent to which the influence relations between principals and teachers were altered.

Teacher involvement in innovations varied greatly. The entire faculty was usually involved in initial approval and annual reconsideration of innovations. Teachers also participated in varying degrees in initiating, planning, and overseeing implementation. Almost all teachers participated in working out Block Scheduling, an innovation in elementary schools, where all teachers were affected by the results. Only special area and primary teachers were sometimes left out of the planning process.

On the other hand, decisions regarding Different Roles for Teachers and Peer Evaluation tended to involve only a subset of the school staff. Typically, shared decision-making cadres, including administrators and teachers, defined and subsequently evaluated the roles to be played by teachers in these innovations. Additionally, cadres, personnel committees, or ad hoc groups selected and evaluated persons filling some roles. However, almost all Peer Evaluation and collegial hiring participants were appointed, based on teacher interest and ability, by principals. And principals alone supervised incumbents in all these different roles.

With certain innovations, teachers seemed also to be active, not only in the planning and evaluation, but also in the day-to-day supervision. This was especially true of School-Within-a-School innovations at high schools. Affecting only part of the school population and involving only a few teachers, participating teachers held strong control over the content and administration of the programs.

In contrast to other innovations, School-Within-a-School and Teachers as Advisors innovations in middle schools were guided primarily by administrative decisions, from both district administrators and building principals. The district assigned schools to specific timelines for transition to middle school status and provided guidelines and training to insure similarity. Principals had the responsibility to oversee implementation. Staff contributed to structure and content and provided support in the form of training and materials development. The success of one middle school's advisement program was attributed to the commitment of the principal to the middle school model. Advisement was well integrated into the other aspects of the model, and commitment to the model was a strong consideration in hiring new staff.

There were interesting concomitants of more or less teacher involvement. When teachers held most control over innovations, the innovations seemed to be least stable, most subject

to modifications. In both senior high schools, teachers redesigned School-Within-a-School programs after one year so that they were no longer distinct units. Although Block Scheduling innovations appeared to be in place at the close of three pilot years, yearly adjustments were not unusual. Innovations related to conversion to middle school, on the other hand, seemed quite stable.

More than other innovations, Different Roles for Teachers had to continually meet approval of staff. This was because instituting most of these roles involved the sacrifice of some other resource, such as an assistant principal or extra teacher, and most involved some release from teaching duties for the teachers that filled them. Given the involvement of only some faculty in different roles, it is not surprising that teacher surveys revealed more divergent attitudes toward Different Roles for Teachers than other types of innovations. In the first year, sometimes half of the staff responding to surveys were not even aware of the new roles, and support for these innovations ranged from 53% to 95% of respondents at schools that polled their staffs.

Thus, these roles changed over the years, especially at the end of the third year (1989-90), in response to staff desires. For example, a middle school with four assistants to the principal positions (three part-time) retained only the one judged most helpful by teachers (discipline assistant) when budget limitations ensued. Another middle school rejected its discipline dean in favor of a full-time middle school coordinator when that need became more pressing. Collegial hiring seemed to be the most successful and widely supported of the Different Roles for Teachers, perhaps because it did not require extra resources or release from classes.

In conclusion, this analysis of teacher influence regarding innovations suggests that some alteration took place in the influence relations between principals and teachers. Innovations in which schools had some discretion, i.e., Peer Evaluation, Different Roles for Teachers, Block Scheduling, and School-Within-a-School in senior highs, were subject to faculty approval and were initiated, modified, and reapproved by formal faculty consent. On the other hand, those district-initiated innovations associated with conversion to middle school status, although also subject to faculty input, seemed to move forward according to the administration's prescribed format. Administrators did, however, seem to have the most involvement in the day-to-day implementation of innovations and in any supervision required. Only for School-Within-a-School in senior highs did accountability seem to be in the hands of teachers throughout implementation.

Nature of roles. A second indicator of alteration of influence relations between principals and teachers are the roles that teachers took on in carrying out innovations. Some of the innovations involved assuming a role non-traditional for teachers for only brief periods. Others involved assuming such roles full-time. Most new roles were administrative and, therefore, had potential for altering influence relations between teachers and principals.

Aside from advisement responsibilities teachers took on in Teachers as Advisors innovations, new roles were administrative in nature. Some new tasks were small and well-defined; others encompassed more variety and were carried out throughout the school year. Block Scheduling involved teachers in arranging the schedule. Team leaders or lead teachers in School-Within-a-School innovations, on the other hand, took on varied responsibilities involving a small team of teachers. However, it was primarily Different Roles for Teachers, including Peer Evaluation, which involved teachers taking on wide-spread, non-traditional administrative roles.

Teacher participation in design and implementation of Different Roles for Teachers resulted in greater administrative structure in schools. Teachers took on administrative

duties in addition to, or in lieu of, their own. Although in three schools new teacher roles replaced assistant principals, the net impact even in those schools was a greater proportion of school personnel devoted to administrative tasks than had been previously. This was because of additional part-time roles developed for other teachers. Some teachers gained a larger view of the school as a result of participation in administrative tasks. However, other teachers gained little involvement through the creation of these special roles at their schools.

Although teachers had input into decisions regarding this innovation, even roles originating from instructional perspectives, such as lead teachers, became devoted to the administrative aspects of the job. Therefore, the roles helped administrators serve teachers and students better but did not reflect new non-administrative duties. Roles that countered this tendency by bringing teachers closer to each other's classrooms experienced difficulties in implementation and continuation. One example was a Peer Evaluation model that involved voluntary participation of teachers. With its goal of school-wide training in classroom observation and informal observation and feedback from other teachers, it exemplified mutual instructional support. However, existing training opportunities and the personal satisfaction derived from observing colleagues voluntarily were not sufficient to encourage widespread participation.

In addition, two roles that underwent substantial change or rethinking at the conclusion of the three-year pilot had received criticism for "lack of clarity." One middle school staff had created lead teachers whose job description included mentoring new teachers and supporting the professional development of all staff. At the end of the three-year pilot, staff redefined the role to entail student discipline. In each annual school administrative review, teachers at this school had called for clearer definition of goals and more direct involvement with teachers from the incumbents. Teachers conducting Peer Evaluation at a senior high school found their program temporarily suspended at the end of the third year. The reason given was lack of clarity in the role. Perhaps these roles were too close to the classroom to survive social constraints on proper teacher roles (Smylie and Denny, 1990).

In conclusion, most non-traditional roles that teachers took on in carrying out innovations were administrative in nature. They participated in administration in areas that ranged from advice to actually carrying out policy in hiring, teacher evaluation, and student discipline. This practice altered the influence relations between teachers and principals in that teachers influenced the design of the administrative structure and participated in administrative functions.

Conclusions and Implications

This analysis of Dade County's school-based management from the perspective of the innovations it encouraged yields two conclusions relative to actual alteration of influence relationships.

First, while some school-level discretion was allowed in areas related to budget, personnel, and educational program, most deviations from regular policy were subject to approval by central office administrators through a waiver system. Thus, in comparison with ideal models offered by Shanker and others, Dade County's model was a limited implementation, not altering the influence relations between district and school.

Second, within schools, teacher involvement in defining, planning, and deciding whether to continue innovations actually altered influence relation between teachers and principals. However, this alteration was mitigated somewhat by two factors: 1) supervision of innova-

tion implementation was most often left to principals; and 2) increased opportunities for formal input from teachers resulted in most cases in additional administrative involvement in schools by a few teachers, rather than widespread alteration of influence relations between teachers and principals.

These conclusions have implications for administrators considering the implementation of school-based management. These implications might fall under the category of "fixing," or improving upon, the Dade County model, or questioning the basic assumptions of the generic school-based management concept.

"Fixing" the Model

I shall now turn to some ideas that relate to "fixing," or improving upon, Dade County's school-based management model. They center on further support the district could provide in order to ensure more successful implementation.

The Superintendent's Role

In their study of "decentralization" in a smaller urban school district, Wissler and Ortiz (1988) stress the importance of the superintendent's long-term support. A change of the magnitude of school-based management needs more than to be started; participants need encouragement, support, impetus from district leaders over a period of several years. Meetings were held in the fall and spring of each year of the pilot for representatives from the pilot schools. These served as forums for sharing ideas among schools, as well as platforms for support from district leadership.

The superintendent in Dade County changed during the final year of the pilot, when a number of other schools were also entering school-based management for the first time. Personnel at the pilot schools were unsure about support for school-based management by the new administration. It is likely that this insecurity, coupled with severe budget constraints due to state cutbacks in funding, caused pilot schools to curtail or eliminate several of their innovations at the end of the third year, or at least to carry them out with less enthusiasm. If school-based management is to thrive in Dade County, there will need to be strong and continuous support from a stable leadership.

The Role of Training

A systematic program of training is needed to provide the expertise needed to govern schools at their sites. We make a false assumption when we assume that school-level personnel are universally prepared for site-based management (McGill, 1989). In contrast to Dade County's efforts which were valiant and voluntary, but never enough (Strusinski, 1991), Jefferson County Public Schools in Louisville, Kentucky, centered their restructuring effort on a professional development academy. Supported by both the community and the district, it served not only as a training facility but also as a catalyst for reform at individual schools (David, 1989a). Dade County needs to make more training available in both the substance of specific innovations and the understanding of organizations.

Promising innovations. Rather than leaving school-based management choice completely open, Dade County should probably support a pool of promising innovations from which schools can select those they wish to implement. School staff seem to respond to the flexibility that choice of innovations allows them. However, innovations such as peer evaluation and block scheduling appear more instructionally effective than others. Also, innovations such as peer evaluation and teachers as advisors require more district support in the form of training and materials development. If sufficient training and other support are

provided, perhaps innovations could be more fully implemented, rather than being instituted piecemeal.

Organizational behavior. Even with better knowledge of innovations, however, the school-based management concept may falter because of lack of understanding of the organizations in which the innovation is taking place. The Dade County model has involved teachers taking on non-traditional roles both as decision-makers and, in certain innovations as quasi-administrators. Certain structural and social constraints associated with the teaching profession may prevent the acceptance of new types of roles (Smylie and Denny, 1990). Specifically, the structure of teachers' schedules may not permit the time or the opportunity for interaction between teachers and teacher-leaders. In addition, social norms of the teaching profession have been found to include "strong commitment to norms of equality, autonomy, and privacy" (p.253) which conflict with ideas of teachers as instructional leaders or supervisors.

Thus, something more than training of teacher-leaders in specific skills is needed. If school-based management models that call for teachers to assume new roles are to succeed, a better understanding of the organization in which they work and their place in it needs to emerge.

Questioning the Concept

While adherence to the suggestions above might improve its implementation in a district, there remains some question as to whether school-based management can perform up to the expectations associated with it. Innovations like the five discussed in this paper are designed to have indirect impact upon achievement. That is, they should result in better organized schools staffed by more professional teachers which, in turn, are expected to contribute to better attendance, more discipline, and higher achievement in students. Although there is evidence that some of these factors may have improved under these innovations, there is some question as to whether the improvement will continue or be significant. Two assumptions of school-based management must be questioned: first, that there are more resources in a school that can be tapped merely by changing the structure of the organization and not increasing the resources flowing to it; second, that a school staff will necessarily be more resourceful when acting independently than when administered by a larger bureaucracy.

Is More Freedom Enough?

Although the current school-based management movement differs from some earlier decentralization efforts aimed at increasing administrative efficiency (David, 1989b), the assumption that reorganization of resources will increase productivity is still implied by the rhetoric of restructuring. Purported to encourage school initiative leading to more effectiveness (David, 1989b, Tyack, 1990), this movement contributes no additional resources to achieving this goal, and thus aims to increase productivity without increasing cost. This is the equivalent of increasing efficiency.

Increased initiative, however, is not a substitute for more resources. In Dade County, one school saved on utility bills and used the money saved to improve their program. In other cases certain resources were sacrificed to fund others. One school increased class size in order to fund a lead teacher. Another sacrificed an assistant principal for more aides. A third traded an assistant principal for a discipline dean and, three years later, exchanged the discipline for a middle school coordinator. All of these exceptions required submission of waivers for approval.

Policies and regulations, however, are established for specific reasons (Tyack, 1990). Are individual school staff in a better position than state education agencies, school boards, and central office administrators to decide which policies and regulations are important and which have outlived their usefulness? Much of the role juggling that went on in the pilot schools consisted of "robbing Peter to pay Paul." Furthermore, the amount of trade-offs and elimination of innovations due to staff reassessment of innovations and budget constraints, especially in the area of different roles for teachers, may have prevented some innovations from being fully tested.

Does Independence Encourage Innovation?

The second assumption that school staff acting independently will be more innovative than under the direction of the school bureaucracy was not strongly borne out by the DCPS pilot schools. Since these schools volunteered, one would expect a kind of extraordinary spirit among their staff. Yet, about two-thirds of the innovations reported on here were first-order changes. And four out of the nine SBM/SDM schools proposing school-within-a-school in middle schools and teachers as advisors, innovations which seemed to involve second-order changes and which were strongly supported by the district, implemented them at the level of first-order change.

With its decision plan based on a waiver approval system, the DCPS school-based management plan fell far short of Shanker's proposal which would give authority to school-level staff for most policy and regulation exceptions. Was the plan too cautious to have much meaningful impact? Would giving the schools more autonomy produce better results? Did schools use the freedom they had to their utmost? Superintendent and principal turnover (Morris, 1991) may have resulted in too little security for radical change. On the other hand, perhaps too little is known about the optimal mix of central office and individual school control, influence, and responsibility.

In conclusion, the Dade County pilot school-based management project recorded no change in influence relations between the district and schools and some change in influence relations between principals and teachers. It could be argued that more support in terms of leadership and training should be provided to school-based management schools. However, one might rather wish to study assumptions of the current school-based management movement regarding increased efficiency through reorganization and increased innovation through autonomy.

REFERENCES

- AASA/NAESP/NASSP School-Based Management Task Force. (1988). *School-based management: A strategy for better learning*. Washington, DC: Authors.
- Collins, R. A. (1988). *Interim evaluation report: School-based management/shared decision-making project, 1987-88, project-wide findings*. Miami: Dade County Public Schools, Office of Educational Accountability.
- Collins, R. A. and Hanson, M. K. (1991). *Summative evaluation report: School-based management/shared decision-making project, 1987-88 through 1989-90*. Miami: Dade County Public Schools, Office of Educational Accountability.
- Cuban, L. (1988). *The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- David, J. L. (1989a). *Restructuring in progress: Lessons from pioneering districts*. Washington, D. C.: National Governors' Association.
- David, J. L. (1989b). Synthesis of research on school-based management. *Educational Leadership*, 46(9), 45-53.
- Malen, B., Ogawa, R. T., & Kranz, J. (In press). What do we know about school based management? A case study of the literature. In W. H. Clune and J. F. Witte (Eds.), *Choice and control in American education* (Vol. 2). Philadelphia: Falmer Press.
- McGill, M. V. (1989). Statement on the Commissioner's Task Force Report: A blueprint for learning and teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 90, 595-606.
- Moloney, W. J. (1989). Restructuring's fatal flaw. *The Executive Educator*, 11(10), 21-23.
- Morris, D. R. (1991) *Initial patterns and subsequent changes in the staff characteristics of SBM/SDM pilot schools, relative to those of non-participating schools*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Shanker, A. (1990). A proposal for using incentives to restructure our public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 71, 345-357.
- Smylie, M. A. & Denny, J. W. (1990). Teacher leadership: Tensions and ambiguities in organizational perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26, 235-259.
- Stover, D. (1989). Edward Ortiz. *The Executive Educator*, 11(10), 19-20.
- Strusinski, M. (1991, April). *The continuing development of shared decision making in school-based management*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Tyack, D. (1990). "Restructuring" in historical perspective: Tinkering toward Utopia. *Teachers College Record*, 92, 170-191.
- Wissler, D. F. & Ortiz, F. I. (1988). *The superintendent's leadership in school reform*. Philadelphia: The Falmer Press.

APPENDIX

PROCEDURES FOR TADS PEER OBSERVATION/EVALUATION

Peer observation/evaluation is consistent with the DCPS and UTD goal of professionalizing education. The involvement of teachers in the assessment of the performance of colleagues acknowledges the expertise of classroom teachers and their critical role in identifying effective teaching practices and providing professional growth support opportunities.

The most important and enduring value of teacher evaluation systems is a strong formative dimension. TADS has received state and national recognition for its developmental approach to the assessment of performance. The focus of the role of Peer Observers/Evaluators should be on support/assistance.

It is noteworthy that the Auxiliary Teaching Behaviors (ATBs) of the TADS constitute an effective vehicle for the further enhancement of teaching effectiveness. These ATBs are a valuable resource for the Peer Observer/Evaluator in providing collegial feedback on observed performance.

1. Peer Observation/Evaluation shall be limited to those School-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making Schools whose plans included a request for waiver to allow such a component and to whom such waivers were granted.
2. A Peer Observer/Evaluator must be a teacher who has a minimum of 3 consecutive acceptable annual evaluations, and who is not currently on prescription.
3. Teachers who are to serve as Peer Observers/Evaluators need not be restricted to observing in their own subject area(s).
4. The Peer Observers/Evaluators shall be selected in accordance with the school's approved shared decision-making process.
5. Use of the data collected by a Peer Observer/Evaluator shall be governed by the stipulations contained in the School-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making school's approved proposal.
6. Peer Observers/Evaluators must be district trained and certified in the use of TADS. District training for Peer Observers/Evaluators will be the same as that provided to administrators/supervisors, with special focus on mentoring, conferencing and the developmental dimension of TAD's AUXILIARY TEACHING BEHAVIORS.
7. Peer Observer/Evaluator collects observation data relative to Categories I through VI on the TADS CAI. Category VII reflects ongoing, professional responsibilities apart from classroom performance and as such will be the responsibility of a school-site administrator rather than the Peer Observer/Evaluator.
8. Observations/Evaluations for any teachers on prescription shall be conducted only by administrative/supervisory personnel. The Peer Observer/Evaluator's role with such teachers shall be a supportive/resource one.

9. CAI Observations conducted for support/developmental purposes:
 - a. Must be announced to the teacher as such prior to conducting the observation(s).
 - b. The observation data shall be used only for developmental/support purposes and shall not be aggregated into the evaluative process.
10. Where data from a Peer Observer/Evaluator observation are to be used in making evaluation decisions, the following procedures shall apply:
 - a. Where a peer observation results in a CAI with an acceptable rating in each category, the following procedures shall be implemented:
 - 1) The Peer Observer/Evaluator confers with the teacher to discuss the observation data. (This is an opportunity to reinforce teaching strengths and enhance professional growth.)
 - 2) The Peer Observer/Evaluator completes the CAI, reviews it with the principal and secures the teacher's signature. This review provides an opportunity for the Peer Observer/Evaluator to discuss the classroom observation data supporting the CAI rating and is not held for the purpose of altering the rating.
 - 3) The Peer Observer/Evaluator personally transmits the signed CAI to the principal or designee. With the exception of the copy provided to the teacher observed, one and only one copy of the CAI is to be made and maintained.
 - b. Where a peer observation results in a CAI with an unacceptable rating in any category, the following procedures shall be implemented:
 - 1) The Peer Observer/Evaluator confers with the teacher to discuss the observation data and seeks clarification, if necessary, prior to completing the CAI.
 - 2) The Peer Observer/Evaluator completes the CAI, reviews it with the principal and secures the teacher's signature. This review provides an opportunity for the Peer Observer/Evaluator to discuss the classroom observation data supporting the CAI rating and is not held for the purpose of altering the rating.
 - 3) The Peer Observer/Evaluator personally transmits the signed CAI to the principal or designee for aggregation into the data to be used in arriving at an evaluation decision. With the exception of the copy provided to the teacher observed, one and only one copy of the CAI is to be made and maintained. At this point the Peer Observer's /Evaluator's role becomes one of support to the teacher.
 - 4) Consistent with the Peer Observer's/Evaluator's support/resource role, future official observations of the teacher involved will be conducted by a member of the school's administrative team.
 - 5) The Peer Observer/Evaluator provides input to the principal or designee into the formulation of the prescription to be advanced, and participates in the prescription conference in this support capacity.

11. Where data from a Peer Observer/Evaluator observation will NOT be used in making evaluation decisions, the following procedures shall apply:
 - a. The Peer Observer/Evaluator will use the CAI for developmental purposes only.
 - b. The completed CAI is given to the teacher observed. No copies are to be made or maintained.
 - c. The Peer Observer/Evaluator confers with the teacher to discuss the observation data. This is an opportunity to reinforce teaching strengths and enhance professional growth on an ongoing basis. The ATBs may be used as a resource for this purpose.
12. In order to further preserve and enhance the Peer Observer's/Evaluator's support/resource role, EXTERNAL REVIEWS will be conducted by administrative/supervisory personnel ONLY.
13. Peer Observers/Evaluators may conduct TADS observations as stipulated herein, but, in accordance with Florida Statutes, all annual evaluations must be completed by the principal.
14. BEGINNING TEACHER PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER NEW HIRES*

A Peer Observer/Evaluator may conduct one of the two observations required within the first 90 days of employment, and one of the other two remaining observations which are required.
15. A-2 AND A-3 CONTRACT TEACHERS*

A Peer Observer/Evaluator may conduct one of the two required observations.
16. CONTINUING AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONTRACT TEACHERS*

A Peer Observer/Evaluator may conduct the one required observation, but the data from the observation must be reviewed by the principal prior to the principal's completion of the annual evaluation form.

*Procedures described apply where data gathered by a Peer Observer/Evaluator are to be used in making evaluation decisions.